R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 981 UD 004 722

ALTERNATIVE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS--A RESPONSE TO AMERICA'S EDUCATIONAL EMERGENCY.

BY- CLARK, KENNETH B.

PUB DATE NOV 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00 23P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SCHOOL SEGREGATION, *EDUCATIONAL DISADVANTAGEMENT, *PUBLIC EDUCATION, *SCHOOL SYSTEMS, *NEGRO EDUCATION, EDUCATIONAL QUALITY, NEGROES, EDUCATIONAL EQUALITY, NONDISCRIMINATORY EDUCATION, EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, BOARDS OF EDUCATION, SCHOOL INTEGRATION, SOCIAL STRUCTURE, SLUM SCHOOLS,

AMERICAN PUBLIC EDUCATION HAS BEEN INEFFICIENT AND UNEQUAL AND HAS EFFECTIVELY BLOCKED ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL MOBILITY FOR NEGROES. CHANGE AND IMPROVEMENT HAVE BEEN IMPEDED BY DOGMAS ABOUT THE INVIOLABILITY OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL, BY ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS, AND BY DEEP-SEATED PSYCHOLOGICAL PREJUDICES. COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN SEGREGATED SCHOOLS, WHILE OSTENSIBLY AMELIORATIVE, MAY SERVE TO PERPETUATE SEGREGATED EDUCATION AND TO OBSCURE THE FACT THAT DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN RECEIVE INFERIOR EDUCATION. A SHIFT IN GOALS FROM IMMEDIATE SCHOOL DESEGREGATION TO INSURING QUALITY EDUCATION FOR NEGROES APPEARS NOW TO BE BOTH EXPEDIENT AND ATTAINABLE. HOWEVER ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL SYSTEMS SHOULD BE DEVELOPED IF IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO HAVE EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE IN SEGREGATED SCHOOLS. REALISTIC AND PRACTICAL PARALLEL SYSTEMS MIGHT INCLUDE STATE FINANCED REGIONAL SCHOOLS WHICH CUT ACROSS URBAN-SUBURBAN LINES, OR FEDERALLY FINANCED SCHOOLS WHICH ARE INTERSTATE AND POSSIBLY RESIDENTIAL. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, BUSINESS, INDUSTRY, AND LABOR UNIONS MIGHT OPERATE SCHOOLS WHICH WOULD BE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC. ALSO THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT COULD EXPAND ITS EXISTING ARMY SCHOOLS AND MAINTAIN THEM OUTSIDE OF THE MILITARY. HOWEVER THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVE AND COMPETITIVE SYSTEMS MUST NEVER PRECLUDE THE GOAL OF QUALITY INTEGRATED EDUCATION. THIS PAPER WAS PREPARED FOR THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY IN AMERICA'S CITIES, SPONSORED BY THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS, WASHINGTON, D.C., NOVEMBER 16-18, 1967. (NH)

ED015981

04722

ALTERNATIVE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS: A RESPONSE TO AMERICA'S EDUCATIONAL EMERGENCY

Prepared by
Kenneth B. Clark, President
Metropolitan Applied Research Center
for the
National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity
in America's Cities
sponsored by the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.
November 16-18, 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD 004 922

I. The Facts

It is now clear that American public education is organized and functions along social and economic class lines. A bi-racial public school system, wherein approximately 90 per cent of American children are required to attend segregated schools is one of the clearest manifestations of this basic fact. The difficulties encountered in attempting to desegregate public schools in the South as well as in the North point to the tenacity of the forces seeking to prevent any basic change in the system.

The class and social organization of American public schools is consistently associated with a lower level of educational efficiency in the less privileged schools. This lower efficiency is expressed in terms of the fact that the schools attended by Negro and poor children have less adequate educational facilities than those attended by more

privileged children. Teachers tend to resist assignments in Negro and other underprivileged schools and generally function less adequately in these schools. Their morale is generally lower; they are not adequately supervised and they tend to see their students as less capable of learning. The parents of the children in these schools are usually unable to bring about any positive changes in the conditions of these schools.

The general pervasive and persistent educational inefficiency which characterizes these schools results in:

1. marked and cumulative academic retardation in a disproportionately high percentage of these children beginning in the third or fourth grade and increasing through the eighth grade;

2. a high percentage of dropouts in the junior and senior high schools of students unequipped academically and occupationally for a constructive role in society;

3. a pattern of rejection and despair and hopelessness resulting in massive human wastage.

Given these conditions, American public schools have become significant instruments in the blocking of economic mobility and in the intensification of class distinctions rather than fulfilling their historic function of facilitating such mobility.

In effect, the public schools have become captives of a middle class who have failed to use them to aid others also to move into the middle class--it might even be possible to interpret the role of the controlling middle class as that of using the public schools to block further mobility.

What are the implications of this existing educational inefficiency? In the national interest it is a serious question whether the United States Government can afford the continuation of the wastage of human resources at this period of world history. We cannot conclusively demonstrate a relation between educational inefficiency and other symptoms of personal and social pathology such as crime, delinquency, pervasive urban decay, but there is strong evidence that these are correlates.

Increasing industrialization and automation of our economy will demand larger numbers of skilled and educated and fewer uneducated workers. The manpower needs of contemporary America require business and industry to pay for the added burden of re-educating the mis-educated. This is a double taxation. The burdens of the present inefficient public education include the double taxation in addition to the high cost of crime and family instability and the artificial constriction of the labor and consumer market.

Beyond these material disadvantages are the human costs inherent in the demand of equality of educational opportunity. This dehumanization contributes significantly to the cycle of pathology--poor education, menial jobs or unemployment, family instability, group and personal powerlessness. This passive pathology weakens the fabric of the entire society.

II. Obstacles to the Attainment of Efficient Education

The obstacles which interfere with the attainment of efficient public education fall into many categories. Among them are those obstacles which reflect historical premises and dogmas about education, administrative realities, and psychological assumptions and prejudices.

The historical premises and dogmas include such fetishes as the inviolability of the Neighborhood School concept which might include the belief that schools should be economically and racially homogeneous.

The administrative barriers involve such problems as those incurred in the transportation of children from residential neighborhoods to other areas of the city. Here again the issue is one of relative advantages of the status quo versus the imperatives for change.

The residual psychological prejudices take many forms and probably underlie the apparent inability of society to resolve the historical and administrative problems. Initially the academic retardation of Negro children was explained in terms of their inherent racial inferiority. The existence of segregated schools was supported either by law or explained in terms of the existence of segregated neighborhoods. More recently the racial inferiority or legal and custom interpretations have given way to more subtle explanations and support for continued inefficient education. Examples are theories of "cultural deprivation" and related beliefs that the culturally determined educational inferiority of Negro children will impair the ability of white children to learn if they are taught in the same classes. It is assumed that because of their background, Negro children and their parents are poorly motivated for academic achievement and will not only not be able to compete with white children but will also retard the white children. The implicit and at times explicit assumption of these cultural deprivation theories is that the environmental deficits which Negro children bring with them to school make it

difficult, if not impossible, for them to be educated either in racially homogeneous or hetrogeneous schools. This point of view, intentionally or not, tends to support the pervasive rejection of Negro children and obscures and intensifies the basic problem.

There are more flagrant sources of opposition to any effective desegregation of American public schools. White Citizens groups in the South, Parents and Taxpayers groups in the North, and the control of boards of education by whites who identify either overtly or covertly with the more vehement opposition to change are examples of effective resistance. School officials and professional educators have defaulted in their educational responsibility for providing educational leadership. They have tended, for the most part, to go along with the level of community readiness and the "political realities." They have been accessories to the development and use of various subterfuges and devices for giving the appearance of change without its substance and, in doing so, have failed to present the problem of the necessary school reorganization in educational terms. This seems equally true of teachers and teachers' organizations. In some cases, teachers, textbooks, and other teaching materials have either contributed to or failed to counteract racism.

Within the past two years another formidable and insidious barrier in the way of the movement towards effective, desegregated public schools has emerged in the form of the black power movement and its demands for racial separatism. Some of the more vocal of the black power advocates who have addressed themselves to the problems of education have explicitly and implicitly argued for Negroes' control of

"Negro Schools". Some have asserted that there should be separate school districts organized to control the schools in all-Negro residential areas; that there should be Negro Boards of Education, Negro Superintendents of Schools, Negro faculty and Negro curricula and materials. These demands are clearly a rejection of the goals of nonsegregated education and a return to the pursuit of the myth of the possibility of an efficient "separate but equal" -- or the pathetic wish for a separate and superior -- racially organized system of education. One may view this current trend whereby some Negroes themselves seem to be asking for a racially segregated system of education as a reflection of the frustration resulting from white resistance to genuine desegregation of the public schools since the Brown decision and as a reaction to the reality that the equality of education in the de facto segregated Negro schools in the north and the Negro schools in the south has steadily deteriorated under the present system of white control.

In spite of these explanations, the demand for segregated schools can be no more acceptable coming from Negroes than they are coming from white segregationists, there is no reason to believe, and certainly there is no evidence to support the contention, that all-Negro schools, controlled by Negroes, will be any more efficient in preparing American children to contribute constructively to the realities of the present and future world. The damage inherent in racially isolated schools was persuasively documented by the comprehensive study conducted by the United States Commission on Civil Rights*.

*Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, A Report of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1967.

Furthermore, the more subtle and insidious educational deprivation for white children who are required to attend all-white schools is totally impaired by both the black and white advocates of racially homogeneous schools.

III. Attempts at Remedies

In spite of these obstacles in the path of genuine desegregation of American public schools and the attainment of effective, non-racially constrained education for all American children, there have been persistent attempts to compensate for the deficits of racial isolation in the American public schools. A tremendous amount of energy and money has been expended in the attempt to develop special programs designed to improve the academic achievement of Negro children, who are the most obvious victims of inferior, racially segregated public schools.

The United States Commission on Civil Rights report, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, has presented facts which raise questions concerning the long-range effectiveness of these programs. There is some evidence that these special programs do some good and help some children; but they clearly underline the inadequacy of the regular education these children receive. In addition to the fact that they obscure the overriding reality that underprivileged children are being systematically short-changed in their regular segregated and inferior schools, these programs may also be seen as a type of commitment for the continuation of segregated education.

If one accepts the premise which seems supported by all available evidence, and above all by the reasoning of the Brown

decision, that racially segregated schools are inherently inferior, it would seem to follow that all attempts to improve the quality of education in all-Negro and all-white schools would have necessarily limited positive effects. All programs designed to raise the quality of education in racially homogeneous schools would therefore have to be seen as essentially evasive programs or as the first stage in an inferior approach to a serious plan for effective desegregation of public schools. Given the resistance to direct an immediate reorganization of the present system of racially organized schools to a more effective system of racially heterogeneous schools, one may be required to attempt to increase the efficiency of education in all-Negro schools as a necessary battle in the larger struggle for racially desegregated schools.

The problem of the extent to which it is possible to provide excellent education in a predominantly Negro school should be re-examined thoroughly in spite of the basic premise of the Brown decision that racially segregated schools are inherently inferior. Some questions which we must now dare to ask and seek to answer as the basis for a new strategy in the assault against the inhumanity of the American system of racial segregation are:

1. Is the present pattern of massive educational inferiority and inefficiency found in predominantly Negro schools inherent and inevitable in racially segregated schools?

2. Is there anything which can be done within the Negro schools to raise them to a tolerable level of educational efficiency--or to raise them to a level of educational excellence?

If the answer to the first question is yes and to the second question is no, then the strategy of continued and intensified assault on the system of segregated schools is justified and should continue unabated since there is no hope of raising the quality of education for Negro children as long as they are condemned to segregated schools--there is no hope of salvaging them. If, on the other hand, the answers to the above questions are reversed it would suggest that a shift in strategy and tactics, without giving up the ultimate goals of eliminating the dehumanizing force of racial segregation from American life, would be indicated. This would suggest that given the present strong and persistent resistance to any serious and effective desegregation of our public schools, that the bulk of the available organizational, human, and financial resources and specialized skills be mobilized and directed toward obtaining the highest quality of education for Negro students without regard to the racial composition of the schools which they attend. This would demand a massive, system-wide educational enrichment program designed to obtain educational excellence in the schools attended by Negro children.

Recent experiences in New York City, Boston, Chicago, Philadelphia and other northern cities reveal that this temporary shift in the battleground will not in itself lead to any easier victory. School boards and public school officials seem as resistant to developing or implementing programs designed to improve the quality and efficiency of education provided for Negro children in segregated schools as they are deaf to all requests for effective desegregation plans and programs. The interests and desires of white middle class parents,

groups, organizations and the interests of the increasingly powerful teachers' federations and professional supervisory associations are invariably given priority over the desire of Negro parents for non-segregated quality education for their children. The interests of the white parents, teachers and supervisors are often perceived by them as inimical to the desires of the Negro parents. Furthermore, the capture and control of the public schools by the white middle class parents and teachers provided the climate within which the system of racially segregated and inferior schools could be developed, expanded and reinforced; and within which the public schools became instruments for blocking rather than facilitating the upward mobility of Negroes and other lower status groups. One, therefore, could not expect these individuals and groups to be sympathetic and responsive to the pleas of Negro parents for higher quality education for their children. Negro parents and organizations must accept and plan their strategy in terms of the fact that adversaries in the battle for higher quality education for Negro children will be as numerous and as formidable as the adversaries in the battle for nonsegregated schools. Indeed they will be the same individuals, officials and groups in different disguises and with different excuses for inaction but with the same powerful weapons of evasion, equivocation, inaction or tokenism.

An effective strategy for the present and the future requires rigorous and honest appraisal of all of the ralities, a tough-minded diagnosis of the strengths and weaknesses of the Negro and his allies. We cannot now permit ourselves to be deluded by wishful thinking, sentimental optimism or rigid and oversimplified ideological postures.

We must be tough-mindedly pragmatic and flexible as we seek to free our children from the cruel and dehumanizing inferior and segregated education inflicted upon them by the insensitive, indifference, affably and at times callously rigid custodians of American public education.

In developing a presently appropriate strategy and the related flexible tactics, it must be clearly understood that the objective of increasing the quality of education provided for Negro children is not a substitute for or a retreat from the fundamental goal of removing the anachronism of racially segregated schools from American life. The objective of excellent education for Negro and other lower status children is inextricably linked with the continuing struggle to desegregate public education. All of the public school, college and professional school civil rights litigation instituted by the legal staff of the NAACP arose from recognition of the obvious fact that the segregated schools which Negroes were forced by law to attend were inferior and therefore damaging and violative of the equal protection clause to the 14th amendment of the United States Constitution.

The suggested shift in emphasis from desegregation to quality of education is not a retreat into the blind alley of accepting racial separation as advocated by the Negro nationalist groups; nor is it the acceptance of defeat in the battle for desegregation. It is rather a regrouping of forces, a shift in battle plans and an attempt to determine the most vulnerable flanks of the opposition as the basis for major attack. The resisting educational bureaucracies,

their professional staffs, and the segment of the white public which has not yet been infected fatally by the American racist disease are most vulnerable to attack on the issue of the inferior quality of education found in Negro schools and the need to institute a plan immediately to raise the educational level of these schools. The economic, political, military, social stability, international, democratic, humane and self interests arguments in favor of an immediate massive program for educational excellence in predominantly Negro schools are so persuasive as to be irrefutable. The expected resistance should be overcome with intelligently planned and sustained efforts.

The first phase of an all-out attack on the inferior education now found in racially segregated schools should be coordinated with a strategy and program for massive and realistic desegregation of entire school systems. This more complicated phase of the overall struggle will continue to meet the resistances of the past with increased intensity. It will be necessary, therefore, to break this task down into its significant components and determine the timing and phasing of the attack on each or combinations of the components. For example:

--The evidence and arguments demonstrating the detrimental effects of segregated schools on the personality and effectiveness of white children should be gathered, evaluated and widely disseminated in ways understandable to the masses of whites.

--The need to reorganize large public school systems away from the presently inefficient and uneconomic neighborhood schools to more modern and viable systems of organization such as

educational parks, campuses, clusters must be sold to the general public in terms of hard dollars and cents and educational efficiency benefiting all children rather than in terms of public school desegregation.

--The need to consolidate small, uneconomic and relatively ineffective school districts into larger educational and fiscal systems in order to obtain more efficient education for suburban and exurban children must also be sold in direct practical terms rather than in terms of desegregation of schools.

--The need to involve large metropolitan regional planning in the mobilization, utilization and distribution of limited educational resources on a more efficient level must also be explored and discussed publicly.

--The movement toward decentralization of large urban school systems must be carefully monitored in order to see that decentralization does not reinforce or concretize urban public school segregation--and to assure that decentralization is consistent with the more economically determined trend toward consolidation and regional planning allocation of resources and cooperation.

A final indication that the phase 1 struggle for excellent education for Negro children in ghetto schools is not inconsistent with the phase 2 struggle for nonsegregated education for all children is to be seen in the fact that if it were possible to raise the quality of education provided for Negro children who attend the urban schools to a level of unquestioned excellence it is possible that this would stem

the flight of middle class whites to the suburbs and reattract some of those who have already left back to the city. Hence a phase 1 activity would increase the chances of obtaining nonsegregated education in our cities. Similarly some of the program suggestions of phase 2, such as educational parks and campuses and the possibilities of regional planning and educational cooperation across present municipal boundaries could lead to a substantial degree of public school desegregation involving a significant proportion of Negro and white children.

The goal of high quality education for Negro and lower status children and the goal of public school desegregation are inextricable; the attainment of the one will lead to the attainment of the other. It is not likely that there could be effective desegregation of the schools without a marked increase in the academic achievement and personal and social effectiveness of Negro and white children. Neither is it possible to have a marked increase in the educational efficiency of Negro schools and the resulting dramatic increase in the academic performance of Negro children without directly and indirectly facilitating the process of public school desegregation.

IV. Problems of Educational Monoply

It is possible that all attempts to improve the quality of education in contemporary, racially-segregated public schools,and all attempts to desegregate these schools will have minimal positive results. The rigidity of present patterns of public school organization and the concomitant stagnation in quality of education and academic performance of children may not be amenable to any attempts at change working through and within the present system.

Until the influx of minority group youngsters into urban public schools, the American public school system was justifiably credited with being the chief instrument for making the American dream of upward social, economic and political mobility a reality. The depressed immigrants from southern and eastern Europe could use American public schools as the ladder toward the goals of assimilation and success. The past successes of American public education seem undebatable. The fact that American public schools were effective mobility vehicles for white American immigrants makes even more stark and intolerable their present ineffectiveness for minority group children. Now it appears that the present system of organization and functioning of urban public schools is a chief blockage in the mobility of the masses of Negro and other lower status minority group children. The inefficiency of their schools and the persistence and acceptance of the explanations for this generalized inefficiency are clear threats to the viability of our cities and national stability. The relationship between long standing urban problems of poverty, crime and delinquency, broken homes--the total cycle of pathology, powerlessness, personal and social destructiveness-which haunt our urban ghettos and the breakdown in the efficiency of our public schools is now unavoidably clear. It is not enough for those responsible for our public schools to assert passively that the schools merely reflect the pathologies and injustices of our society. Public schools and their administrators must assert boldly that education must dare to challenge and change society toward social justice as the basis for democratic stability.

There remains the disturbing question--a most relevant question probably too painful for educators themselves to ask--whether the selective process involved in training and promoting educators and administrators for our public schools emphasize qualities of passivity, conformity, caution, smoothness, superficial affability rather than boldness, creativity, substance and the ability to demand and obtain those things which are essential for solid and effective public education for all children. If this is true, then all hopes that the imperative reforms which must be made so that city public schools can return to a level of innovation and excellence are reduced to a minimum, if not totally eliminated, if we are dependent upon the present educational establishment.

The racial components of the present crisis in urban public education clearly make the possibilities of solution more difficult and may contribute to the passivity and pervading sense of hopelessness of school administrators. Aside from any latent or subtle racism which might infect school personnel themselves, they are hampered by the gnawing awareness that with the continuing flight of middle class whites from urban public schools and with the increasing competition which education must make for a fair share of the tax dollar, it is quite possible that Americans will decide deliberately or by default to sacrifice urban public schools on the altars of its historic and contemporary forms of racism. If this can be done without any real threat to the important segments of economic and political power in the society and with only Negro children as the victims, then there is no realistic basis for hope that our urban public schools will be saved.

The hope for a realistic approach to saving public education in American cities seems to this observer to be found in finding the formula whereby it can be demonstrated to the public at large that the present level of public school inefficiency has reached an intolerable stage of public calamity. It must be demonstrated that minority group children are not the only victims of the monopolistic inefficiency of our present pattern of organization and functioning of our public schools.

It must be demonstrated that white children--privileged white children whose parents understandably seek to protect them by moving to suburbs and private and parochial schools--also suffer potentially and immediately.

It must be demonstrated that business and industry suffer intolerable financial burdens of double and triple taxation in seeking to maintain a stable economy in the face of the public school inefficiency which produces human casualties, rather than constructive human beings.

It must be demonstrated that the cost in correctional, welfare and health services are intolerably high in seeking to cope with consequences of educational inefficiency--that it would be more economical,, even for an affluent society, to pay the price and meet the demands of efficient public education.

It must be demonstrated that a nation which presents itself to the world as the guardian of democracy and the protector of human values throughout the world cannot itself make a mockery of these significant ethical principles by dooming one tenth of its own population

to a lifetime of inhumane futility because of remediable educational deficiencies in its public schools.

These must be understood and there must be the commitment to make the average American understand them if our public schools and our cities are to be effective.

But it does not seem likely that the changes necessary for increased efficiency of our urban public schools will come about because they should. Our urban public school systems seem muscle bound with tradition. They seem to represent the most rigid forms of bureaucracies which are paradoxically most resilient in their ability and use of devices to resist rational or irrational demands for change. What is most important in understanding the ability of the educational establishment to resist change is the fact that public school systems are protected public monopolies with only minimal competition from private and parochial schools. Few critics--even severe ones such as myself--of the American urban public schools dare to question the givens of the present orgainization of public education in terms of local control of public schools; in terms of existing municipal or political boundaries; or in terms of the rights and prerogatives of boards of education to establish policy and select professional staff--at least nominally or titularly if not actually; or the relevance of the criteria and standard for selecting superintendents, principals and teachers; or the relevance of all of these to the objectives of public education of producing a literate and informed public to carry on the business of democracy and the goals of producing human beings with social sensitivity and dignity and creativity and a respect for the humanity of others.

A monopoly need not genuinely concern itself with these matters. As long as local schools systems can be assured of state aid and increasing federal aid without the accountability which inevitably comes with aggressive competition, it would be sentimental, wishful thinking to expect any significant increase in the efficiency of our public schools. If there are no alternatives to the present system--short of present private and parochial schools which are approaching their limit of expansion--then the possibilities of improvement in public education are limited.

V. Alternative Forms of Public Education

Alternatives--realistic, aggressive and viable competitors--to the present public school systems must be found. The finding and developing of such competitive public school systems will be attacked by the defenders of the present system as attempts to weaken the present system and thereby weaken, if not destroy, public education. This type of expected self-serving argument can be briefly and accurately disposed of by asserting and demonstrating that truly effective competition strengthens rather than weakens that which deserves to survive. I would argue further that public education need not be identified with the present system of organization of public schools. Public education can be more broadly and pragmatically defined in terms of that form of organization and functioning of an educational system which is in the public interest. Given this definition, it becomes clear that an inefficient system of public systems is not in the public interest:

-- a system of public schools which destroys rather than

develops human positive potentialities is not in the public interest;

-- a system which consumes funds without demonstrating effective returns is not in the public interest;

-- a system which insists that its standards of performance should not or cannot be judged by those who must pay the cost is not in the public interest;

-- a system which says that the public has no competence to judge that a patently defective product is a sign of the system's inefficiency, and demands radical reforms, is not in the public interest;

-- a system which blames its human resources and its society while it quietly acquiesces and inadvertently perpetuates the very injustices which it claims limit its efficiency is not in the public interest.

Given these assumptions, therefore, it follows that alternative forms of public education must be developed if the children of our cities are to be educated and made constructive members of our society.

In the thinking of alternatives all attempts must at the same time be made to strengthen our present urban public schools. Such attempts would involve reexamination, revision, and strengthening of curricula, methods, personnel selection and evaluation; the development of more rigorous procedures of supervision, reward of superior performance and the institution of a realistic and tough system of

accountability, and the provision of meaningful ways of involving the parents and the community in the activities of the school.

In spite of the above, the following are suggested as possible realistic and practical competitors to the present form of urban public school systems:

1. Regional State Schools: These schools would be financed by the states and would cut across present urban-suburban boundaries.

2. Federal Regional Schools: These schools would be financed by the Federal Government out of present state aid funds or with additional federal funds. These schools would be able to cut through state boundaries and could make provisions for residential students.

3. College and University Related Open Schools: These schools would be financed by colleges and universities as part of their laboratories in education. They would be open to the public and not restricted to children of faculty and students. Obviously, public students would be selected in terms of constitutional criteria and their percentage determined by realistic considerations.

4. Industrial Demonstration Schools: These schools would be financed by industrial, business and commercial firms for their employees and selected members of the public. These would not be vocational schools--but elementary and comprehensive high schools of quality. They would be sponsored by combinations of business and industrial

firms in much the same way as churches and denominations sponsor and support parochial or sectarian schools.

5. Labor Union Sponsored Schools: These schools would be financed and sponsored by Labor Unions largely, but not exclusively, for the children of their members.

6. Army Schools: The Defense Department has been quietly effective in educating some of the casualties of our present public schools. It is hereby suggested that they now go into the business of repairing hundreds of thousands of these human casualties with affirmation rather than apology. Schools for adolescent drop-outs or educational rejects could be set up by the Defense Department adjacent to camps--but not necessarily an integral part of the military. If this is necessary, it should not block the attainment of the goal of rescuing as many of these young people as possible. They are not expendable on the altar of anti-militarism rhetoric.

With a strong, efficient and demonstrably excellent parallel system of public schools, organized and operating on a quasi-private level, and with quality control and professional accountability maintained and determined by Federal and State educational standards and supervision, it would be possible to bring back into public education a vitality and dynamism which are now clearly missing. Even the public discussion of these possibilities might clear away some of the dank stagnation which seems to be suffocating urban education today. American industrial and material wealth was made possible

through industrial competition. American educational health may be made possible through educational competition.

If we succeed, we will have returned to the dynamic, affirmative goal of education; namely, to free man of irrational fears, superstitions and hatreds. Specifically, in America the goal of democratic education must be to free Americans of the blinding and atrophying shackles of racism. A fearful, passive, apologetic and inefficient educational system cannot help in the attainment of these goals.

If we succeed in finding and developing these and better alternatives to the present educational inefficiency, we will not only save countless Negro children from lives of despair and hopelessness; thousands and thousands of white children from cynicism, moral emptiness and social ineptness--but we will also demonstrate the validity of our democratic promises. We also would have saved our civilization through saving our cities.